



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,600	03/10/2000	Kiyoshi Toyoda	P19203	5789

7055 7590 09/11/2003

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 4

2141

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/522,600

Applicant(s)

TOYODA, KIYOSHI

Examiner

April L Baugh

Art Unit

2141

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) April L Baugh.

(3) _____.

(2) Bill Pieprz.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 September 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent 6,438,605 to Idehara, US Patent 5,812,278 to Toyoda et al., and US Patent 6,061,739 to Reed et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.


Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Pieprz argued the finality of the previous office action, stating that claim 1 was a combination of original claims 1-4. Examiner pointed out the scope of the claim had been changed by now stating a changeable IP address versus the IP address previously disclosed. The attorney argued the examiner used hindsight reconstruction to reject the claims and that there is no motivation to combine. That the examiner's references take an operable system and make it inoperable, and then fix it. The attorney argues Toyoda et al. teaches a memory and fixed address, Idehara teaches user defined routes, and Reed et al. teaches a changeable IP address with no solution. Examiner's position was the combination of Toyoda et al. and Reed et al. create the problem of a system with changeable IP address and that Idehara discloses that the CPU judges the route not the user. The attorney reviewed upcoming amendment after final rejection and feels the limitations added to the claims only make the claims more specific and don't take the claims out of scope and thus feels the claims are allowable.

**GREENBLUM &
BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.****FAX MSG NO. P19203.F10****PAGE 1 OF 2****SENDING TEL. NO. 703-716-1180**

*******CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE*******
The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law firm of Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C. which is confidential and/or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this facsimile information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone at (703) 716-1191 immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

CALLED TEL. NO.: (703) 746-9149 
TO : U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
ATTN : Examiner April L. Baugh
FROM : Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.
DATE : September 9, 2003
SUBJECT : U.S. Patent Application No. 09/522,600 in the name of Kiyoshi TOYODA, entitled "Apparatus and Method for Transmitting and Receiving for Image"; Our Ref: P19203

Dear Examiner Baugh:

Further to our recent discussion regarding the above-noted application, I would like to request a telephone interview regarding the same. In addition, please note that on September 4, 2003, we filed a Response to the outstanding Official Action.

During the interview, I would like to discuss with you the propriety of the finality of the Official Action in view of the fact that the newly submitted claim is essentially a combination of the features of previously pending claims 1-4. In other words, claim 1 as amended by the Response of June 18, 2003, represents claims 1-4 as originally filed. Of course, changes have been made to streamline the language of the claim and to render the same in proper form for U.S. examination but essentially claim 1 comprises the features of previous claims 1-4. Accordingly, I believe that the finality is improper.

Moreover, I would also like to discuss the merits of the outstanding rejection. In particular, the claims relate to transmitting data to an image receiving apparatus which has a changeable IP address which is assigned by an external apparatus. The primary reference does not disclose this feature and accordingly, the features which the Examiner relies upon, TOYOTA for teaching, are not particularly relevant to the claimed invention. In addition,

**GREENBLUM &
BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.**

FAX MSG NO. P19203.F10

PAGE 2 OF 2

I would also like to discuss the deficiencies of the other references in the claimed combination as well as the motivation for combining them in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

Based on our telephone discussion, it is my understanding that you will have the case and that I will call you at 2PM, after you have received this proposed agenda.

I look forward to speaking to you and to resolving the outstanding issues in the present application.

Best regards.
Bill Pieprz

April B.
Bik P.

Tayada → (only fixed)
no changeable IP addresses
only has memory

Telhara → uses input from user
OS/IO/abstract

Reed → changeable IP addresses assigned to operators
but not transmit data
(has problem & no solution)

fixed → operational → changeable → inoperable → fix it → dual mode

hind sight reconstruction
no motivation to continue

user

David
claims allowable
mutations (don't take out of scope)
& still allowable